



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/866,936

05/29/2001

Deane Yang

Kalotay-1

6572

28581

7590

02/12/2008

DUANE MORRIS LLP

PO BOX 5203

PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5203

EXAMINER

LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3692

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/866,936	Applicant(s) YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer Liversedge	Art Unit 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 18 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 18 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/25/2002 copy of previously mailed IDS</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration of application 09/866,936 filed on November 29, 2007.

The amendment contains original claims: 2-3, 6-7, 9-10 and 13-14.

The amendment contains amended claims: 1, 4-5, 8, 11-12, 16, 18 and 20-26.

Claims 15, 17 and 19 have been canceled.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant requested a signed copy of the second page of the submitted IDS indicating that the IDS had been considered. Accordingly, a copy of the first and second pages of the IDS as signed on October 5, 2005 by Timothy Harbeck has been included.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3692

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-14, 16, 18, 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindahl ("Risk-Return Hedging Effectiveness Measures for Stock Index Futures," The Journal of Futures Markets. New York: Aug 1991. Vol. 11, Iss.4; Pg 399, 11 pgs) in view of Malliaris ("Tests of Random Walk of Hedge Ratios and Measures of Hed.qinq Effectiveness for Stock Indexes and Foreign Currencies," The Journal of Futures Markets. Hoboken: Feb 1991. Vo1.11, Iss. ; pg 55, 14 pages), and further in view of the Applicant's Background Disclosure.

Regarding claim 1: Lindahl discloses a measure of hedging effectiveness comprising the steps of:

- Determining a standard deviation of a hedged item (See abstract and Introduction)
- Determining a standard deviation of a combination of said hedged item and a hedging vehicle (See abstract and Introduction)
- Determining a ratio between the standard deviation of said hedged item and said standard deviation of said hedged item and said hedging vehicle (See abstract and introduction)

- Comparing a ratio to a known level to determine hedge effectiveness (See abstract).

Lindahl does not explicitly disclose the steps wherein said standard deviation of said hedged item, said standard deviation of said hedged item and a hedging vehicle, and the ratio between the two represent changes in value over a known time frame.

Malliaris discloses a test of hedge ratios and measures of hedging effectiveness wherein it is implied that "hedges cannot consistently place perfect hedges and need to continuously readjust their hedges. This can be done by using appropriate computational methods that take into account the variable nature of the hedge ratio and the measure of hedging effectiveness (page 66)." Essentially this an admission that hedged items change over time, and for a hedge ratio to be truly effective, the change in value must be measured over time as well.

It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention to include the teachings of Malliaris to that of Lindahl, so a better estimate of hedge effectiveness can be achieved. The computational methods used by Malliaris to take into account the variable nature of the hedge ratio could easily be applied to the ratio disclosed by Lindahl and would provide a better indication of effectiveness than the static measure.

Lindahl does not specifically disclose determining whether the hedge qualifies for hedge accounting. However, Applicant has disclosed in the Background of the Invention that "...to qualify for hedge accounting the hedge must pass a so-called

“effectiveness test”, or in other words be sufficiently “effective””. As Lindahl discloses making a determination as to whether the hedge is effective using two methods of measuring effectiveness, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to then use the made determination of effectiveness of the hedge to then indicate that the hedge thereby qualifies for hedge accounting based on the determination of effectiveness.

Regarding claim 2: Lindahl in view of Malliaris discloses the claimed method supra and while Malliaris does not explicitly disclose the step of determining a volatility measure as a complement to said ratio, Malliaris does hypothesize that volatility is an important factor that is ignored in many hedge ratios. The fact that hedges are variable over time is something that, according to Malliaris, must be factored into any test for effectiveness of hedge ratios (page 66). To do this, Malliaris suggests measuring changes in value over time, which is essentially a measure of volatility. While not explicitly disclosing that a volatility measure is determined, it could very readily be determined with information available in the Malliaris method and further strengthen the current hypothesis.

Regarding claim 3: Lindahl in view of Malliaris discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose wherein said known time period is selected from the group of monthly, quarterly and yearly this step would be obvious because those are notoriously well known in the art as fractions of time in which financial instruments are measured.

Regarding claims 4-7: Lindahl in view of Malliaris discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose the steps of claims 4-8, applicant in his disclosure has admitted these claims as known prior art. These admissions include

- Wherein effectiveness is determined when said ratio is below a known level
(Page 2, Paragraph 0105; below 125%)
- Wherein effectiveness is determined when said ratio is above a known level
(Page 2, Paragraph 0105; above 80%)
- Wherein said known level is based upon conventional financial considerations
(Page 2, Paragraph 0105, Guideline provided by FASB).

Since applicant has admitted that these steps were previously known in the art it would have been obvious to apply them in the same manner to Lindahl in view of Malliaris in order to determine the effectiveness of a hedge ratio.

Regarding claims 8-14, 16, 18, 20-26 further system claims would have been obvious to perform previously rejected method claims 1-7 respectively and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale. Further, where Lindahl in view of Malliaris has been shown in the previously rejected claims 1-7 to disclose the claimed invention. The references do not however discuss the automation of said invention. It would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace

manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16, 18 and 20-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at 571-272-6702. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Liversedge
Examiner
Art Unit 3692

/Harish T Dass/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692